An action is morally permissible if it is not prohibited by morality.

Charles Pidgen explains Dworkin’s definition of “moral permissibility”[[1]](#footnote-1)

In his famous paper 'Objectivity and Truth: You'd Better Believe it' (1996) Ronald Dworkin argues that wholesale or Archimedean moral skepticism of the kind advanced by Mackie (and in my view by Nietzsche) is fundamentally incoherent. **You can't be a skeptic about all moral claims, since if** you think that abortion is not wrong - or if you think that it is not full-bloodedly true that abortion is wrong - you are committed to the first-order view that abortion is morally permissible. But that only holds if you subscribe to something like (RDI) - that [because] the claim that actions of kind X are [is] not wrong, entails that actions of kind X [is] are right (in the sense of morally permissible). [Pidgen disagrees with Dworkin and later provides a rebuttal to Dworkin’s argument.]

Prefer this interpretation because:

**a.** Neg won a significant majority of both prelims and elims at VBT, Emory, Berkeley, and Harvard. Aff needs to set ground to compensate for pervasive neg side bias.

**b.** Aff needs skep ground to prevent neg bidirectionality. Otherwise the neg can argue that morality is either more or less stringent than the aff suggests, which makes it impossible to affirm because any answers I make against one side of the spectrum can be leveraged against me as offense on the other side.

The thesis of the AC is that both debaters should lose the round.

1. If my opponent wins, this will only trade off with another debater breaking, which means there is no net benefit.

2. Voting us both down would put a third person into outrounds, which is good because they would probably be worse and thus would require more practice in order to get better. Prefer this standard because fairness is a gateway issue, and fairness means that we should ensure that all debaters get to equal debating levels. This also means give us both 20 speaker points to prevent us from breaking on speaks.

3. Voting us both down would give us an incentive to work harder, but voting either person up would inflate our self-esteem, so we would be unwilling to work.

4. My opponent's burden is to attack a topical advocacy, but since I have no topical advocacy, they can't attack it and thus we should both lose.

Professor Frans **van Eemeren** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

A debate in the North American style centers around “propositions.” As Austin Freeley described in his prominent book, Argumentation and Debate (1993), in a debate two parties attempts, with the help of argumentation, to justify or refute to a judge a statement about which a difference of opinion exists. **The affirmative side defends the statement in conflict; the negative side attacks it.** The statement that is defended and attacked is called the debate proposition, or proposition (1993: 38). The affirmative side has the burden of proof of the proposition. This means that they need to justify the proposition convincingly to the judge. The negative has no burden of proof; their only task is to attack the proposition.

5. My opponent has the burden to clash with me. Since I am arguing that I should lose, they have the corresponding burden to defend that I should win. If they fail to meet this burden, they have failed to negate and should lose.

6. A good debater should be able to defeat any reasonable affirmative case. Since I don't have a reasonable affirmative case, drop us both because they can't prove that they are good.

7. Both sides must speak at over 300 words per minute for the entire round because the more arguments made more quickly, the more educational the round, and we only do debate for education.

8. Neither side may wear formal attire because it re-entrenches the politicality of debate and restricts argumentation to solely formal situations instead of allowing for more free-form locations of argumentation where the government cannot intervene.

9. Partners are key for debate because they allow mutual discussion on the same side of the issue in order to figure out the best arguments. Since neither of us has one, vote against both of us.

10. Both sides must define every word in the resolution. This is key to stable ground because otherwise they could just newly define a word in their next speech and delink from all my arguments.

11. Both sides must cite multiple dictionaries in their definitions in order to prevent biased definitions. Further, this must also include Eastern dictionaries in order to prevent Western imperialistic discourse.

We both violate all of these standards, so vote us both down to ensure more educational debate in the future. This comes prior to substance since it’s the end goal of debate.

12. All actions taken on Native American land are unjust since it was unjustly taken from them; this includes debate. Before we can do anything not rooted in imperialism, we have to return the land to the Native Americans, so vote us both down for not lobbying to give back the land.

Further, most ethical systems support the idea of a double loss.

13. In Rawlsian contractarianism, it is important to ensure that all people are treated equally so as to prevent racism/sexism and such. The most equal way to treat us is to vote us both down.

14. Utilitarianism says that we should maximize happiness for the greatest number. Thus, you should vote us both down because A. Stock debates get boring over time, B. It would make me happy if you double dropped us both.

15. Deontology says that we should always be reciprocal, that we should follow the golden rule. A. I want them to lose, and thus they have a reason to want me to lose, so you should double-drop us to satisfy it. B. Neither of us have voted for you, so you shouldn't vote for either of us.

16. Buddhism says A. We should constrain our desires in order to reflect on the world. Thus, you should constrain both of our desires to win. B. Meditation is key to understanding of ourselves. Thus, the entire round should be spent silently in meditation. If they speak, they lose. I’ve spoken, so I lose, too.

17. Feminist relations says that the win-loss dichotomy is masculine because it prevents us from engaging in cooperative discussion and instead in everlasting conflict. Vote against us both to reject patriarchy.

18. Double-drop us both in order to unroot the oppressive nature of modern debate that forces us to pit ourselves against each other in exchange for a plastic trophy instead of mutual cooperation.

19. The ballot functions as a commodity supporting the evils of capitalism. Double-drop us both to reject the hierarchical system of oppression and thus equalize us.

20. Foucault says that your voting us up simply reaffirms the power of authority, which is wrong because it allows authority to think of us as just numbers to be used, as just 4-0's instead of living people, and thus justifies war because people become just resources to be consumed.

21. Egoism says that if you are self-interested, you should vote against us both because you will have an interesting story to tell in the future to other judges. It’s key to lulz.

22. Even if there is no morality, A. it is most logical to vote against us both because without morality, nothing is just, so there is no topical case that can affirm or negate. Thus, because neither of us can win if justice does not exist, drop us both. B. Better is a normative term. If morality does not exist, then better is meaningless, so you can't determine who the better debater is.

23. Each affirmative argument is sufficient to affirm by itself in order to combat time bias. If I win one reason why you should vote us both down, do so because the neg has far more time than I do to respond to my arguments.

24. If they drop arguments, then they are not actually better because good debaters don't drop arguments that could cost them the round.

Irrespective of arguments about why you should not vote aff, you should still refrain from voting neg.

25. Because of time bias, since I only have 4 minutes to respond to 7 of theirs and 3 to 6. If they have time to respond to me, then this only proves that they have too much time, so disregard their arguments and drop them.

26. They have time to adapt in the NC, so if they still violate the problems outlined in the AC anyway, their abuse is worse, and if you can only drop one of us, then drop them.

27. If you have to vote for one of us, vote aff so incentivize double loss theory in future debates and minimize the total number of wins.

Finally, any theoretical indicts to the AC are just reasons to drop me, not a reason to vote for him, so even if he wins theory, drop us both anyway.
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